

people. I am prepared for us to understand our differences, understand our mutual interests, and to try to find a way to accommodate those as best as possible. But where I am bargaining with someone who is absolutistic and who will not recognize any other legitimate interests than the ones they espouse, then I am not dealing with a reasonable partner in that case. Those kinds of negotiations are not constructive because they are only played out on one field, theirs. In this case I find that to be what has occurred. The fact that all of the public discussion on this bill centers on the telephone aspect of it, indicates to me that no one critical of LB 565 is prepared to make, with the exception of Senator Hoagland, the concomitant statement that the members of this Legislature are entitled to the same privileges of confidentiality which are guaranteed by the due process clause to the inmates of the Nebraska State Penitentiary. It would seem to me that that is such a basic and essential threshold of reasonableness that parties unable to make that claim, unable to accept that premise, are not entering into this discussion with a reasonable attitude. For that reason I don't care to bargain with them. It seems to me that somebody has to recognize the legitimacy of the interest of one's privacy and confidentiality in their letters and papers as we do in the fourth amendment to say that the people of this country are secure in their papers and in their homes without a right of subpoena to unreasonable searches and seizures. That principle is a valuable one and I find no place in the forces which find LB 565 so unacceptable a legitimate recognition of that principle, and without it I am unprepared to begin discussions on the telephone language. I oppose the Hoagland amendment.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker and members of the body, I am going to rise in opposition to Senator Hoagland's amendment. I thought I would like to spend a bit of time talking about the issue of abuse of the telephone records. It seems to me that that is the focal point of Senator Hoagland's amendment. I guess that is the issue that the press particularly has raised on this matter. The issue is this, if our telephone are somehow not made available to the public and particularly including the press, then obviously you and I as State Senators will be able to make a number of personal telephone calls. We will be able to make a number of telephone calls associated with our private business activities. We will be able to make other telephone calls that simply have no reasonable relationship to our work as state legislators, and that will never be exposed to public view, and because of that we will